

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MONAY JONES, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AMAZON.COM SERVICES, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. [23-cv-06211-AMO](#)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
CASE SHOULD NOT BE
TRANSFERRED**

This is one of ten putative class actions¹ against Amazon for alleged violations of wage and hour laws. The named plaintiffs worked for Amazon in Rialto, Santa Clarita, and Valencia, which are located within the Central District of California. ECF 19 (“Am. Compl.”) ¶¶ 8-9. Because the conduct giving rise to the alleged violations occurred outside of this judicial district, by no later than November 8, 2024, Plaintiffs shall file a brief, of no more than 5 pages, explaining why this case should not be transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California² pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), which provides that a court may transfer a civil action to any other district “[f]or the convenience of parties and witnesses [and] in the interest of justice.” See *Berry v. Amazon.com Services LLC*, No. 3:23-cv-03614-TLT, ECF No. 32 (N.D.

¹ See *Trevino v. Golden State FC LLC*, No. 1:18-cv-00120-KES-BAM (E.D. Cal.); *Porter v. Amazon.com Services, LLC*, No. 2:20-cv-09496-JVS-SHK (C.D. Cal.); *Clayborn v. Amazon.com Services LLC*, No. 5:20-cv-02368-JVS-SHK (C.D. Cal.); *Roman v. Amazon.com Services, LLC*, No. 1:21-cv-00667-CDB (E.D. Cal.); *Scott v. Golden State FC, LLC*, No. 4:21-cv-02147-HSG (N.D. Cal.); *Guerrero v. Golden State FC, LLC*, No. 3:22-cv-01161-AGT (N.D. Cal.); *McKenzie v. Amazon.com Services LLC*, No. 5:22-cv-01987-SSS-SP (C.D. Cal.); *Ford v. Amazon.com Services, LLC*, No. 5:23-cv-01306-JGB-SP (C.D. Cal.); *Arrivas-Arcaina v. Amazon.com Services LLC*, No. 2:23-cv-02961-TLN-DB (E.D. Cal.); and *Berry v. Amazon.com Services, LLC*, No. 1:24-cv-00093-KES-SAB (E.D. Cal.).


² Should the parties believe transfer to a specific division within the Central District is appropriate, they shall address it in their briefs.

1 Cal. Jan. 18, 2024) (transferring case from Northern District of California to the Eastern District of
2 California because the plaintiff's claims arose from events that occurred in Shafter, Kern County,
3 California, located in the Eastern District of California – Fresno). Amazon may also file a brief, of
4 no more than 5 pages, by that date. Any factual contentions made in the briefing must be
5 supported by declarations or other references to the record in compliance with Civil Local Rule
6 7-5. Each side may file no more than 5 pages of supporting declarations. Should the parties reach
7 an agreement regarding transfer, they may file a stipulation to transfer the case in lieu of the
8 required briefing.

9 The November 7, 2024 hearing on the pending motion to dismiss or stay is **VACATED**.
10 The hearing will be re-set, if necessary, following resolution of the transfer issue.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: October 24, 2024

13
14 
15 **ARACELI MARTÍNEZ-OLGUÍN**
16 **United States District Judge**
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28